

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Response amends thirty-one claims and adds no new claims. Consequently, it is believed that this filing has not generated any additional claim fees. It is believed, however, that a three-month extension of time is required. Accordingly, a Petition for a three-month extension of time accompanies this Response. A check in payment of the extension of time fee accompanies this Amendment and Response. Further, if it is determined that additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-2260 in the amount of such fees.

Sections 2-4 of the Office Action reject claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. 101. The claims have been amended in the manner suggested in the office action.

Sections 5-7 of the Office Action reject claims 3-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 3 has been amended to correct the dependency problem.

Sections 8-45 of the Office Action reject claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,374,286 of Gee. Sections 46-47 reject claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,728,746 of Murase. In addition, claims 1, 29 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,728,746 of Murase, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,721,922 of Dingwall. Applicants offer the following remarks regarding the rejections.

The independent claims have been amended to clarify that they relate to a multiple virtual machine environment wherein the virtual machines run concurrently on a single, real-time, embedded processor system. In addition, amendments have been made, where necessary, to specify that designated components are resident on a single

integrated circuit chip. It is believed that the cited references do not show such combinations. For example, Murase and Dingwall do not disclose a system involving a single, real-time, embedded processor system. Likewise, Gee and Murase do not disclose a system that is resident on a single integrated circuit chip in the manner claimed above.

Accordingly, it is believed that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references. Further, it is believed that the above remarks and amendments fully address the issues and rejections raised in the Office Action. Entry of the amendments and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

September 19, 2005
Date

By



Michael F. Williams
Reg. No. 39,875
Attorney for Applicants
(319) 366-7641 (ext. 222)
PTO Customer No. 24234